DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 258 942 SP 026 193

AUTHOR Cole, Donna J.; And Others
TITLE Institutional Change: The Infusion of Human Relations into Preservice Teacher Education Programs.
PUB DATE 1 Mar 85
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Denver, CO, February 27-March 2, 1985).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Change Strategies; Higher Education; *Humanistic Education; *Human Relations; Interpersonal Relationship; *Preservice Teacher Education; Student Attitudes; *Teacher Education Programs; Values
IDENTIFIERS Emporia State University KS; Lenoir Rhyne College NC; Wittenberg University OH

ABSTRACT

The strengthening of human relations education in the preparation of teachers has become legitimately and necessarily the responsibility of each institution engaged in preservice teacher education. Infusion--the permeation of all dimensions of a teacher education program with the development of the concepts, skills, and attitudes necessary to good human relations--is the most appropriate model. Introduced by Robert L. Mulder, three papers are presented on three institutions for higher education: "Wittenberg University" (Ohio), by Donna J. Cole; "Emporia State University" (Kansas), by Theresa E. McCormick; and "Lenoir-Rhyne College" (North Carolina), by Donald G. Hayes. These institutions have developed procedures for assessing their need to strengthen human relations education, and for effecting the necessary changes. Wittenberg utilized an in-house study committee; Emporia State employed a Human Relations Specialist; and Lenoir-Rhyne used data from a longitudinal study of the changes in value commitments experienced by students from entrance to graduation. All three institutions relied heavily upon institutional resources and support for the success of their projects. Given the common needs and the common patterns of teacher education programs, irrespective of the institution in which they are located, the experiences of the three institutions reported here can be helpful to others. (Author/JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED258942

INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE: THE INFUSION OF HUMAN RELATIONS INTO PRESERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Donna J. Cole, Ph.D.
Wittenberg University
Springfield, Ohio

Donald G. Hayes, Ph.D.
Lenoir-Rhyne College
Hickory, North Carolina

Theresa E. McCormick, Ed.D.
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

Robert L. Mulder, Ph.D.
Wittenberg University
Springfield, Ohio

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. J. Cole

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Presentation at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Denver, Colorado, March 1, 1985.

SP026193

Introduction

Robert L. Mulder

The strengthening of human relations education in the preparation of teachers is a very clear and present challenge. In response to this challenge, encouraging advancements have been made over the past decade in basic research, theory development, and policy studies. The responsibility for translating these advancements into propositions pertinent to the structures and content of teacher education programs has been assumed by each institution engaged in teacher education.

What follows is a presentation of the experiences of three such institutions that have been engaged in the practice of strengthening human relations education in their teacher education programs: Wittenberg University (Springfield, Ohio), Emporia State University (Emporia, Kansas), and Lenoir-Rhyne College (Hickory, North Carolina). Since the primary intent is to use all of the time available to describe, reflect upon, and discuss actual programs, direct linkages to specific research, theory, and policy studies are not explained. Each panelist in this presentation assumes that there is sufficient general awareness in the educational community to enable those who encounter these descriptions to make their own connections.

There are four more assumptions which undergird this presentation, and their importance commands some preliminary attention. Each assumption is distinguishable in its own right, but each ultimately interpenetrates the other; they must, therefore, be understood as a package.

The first assumption is that human relations education legitimately and necessarily belongs in teacher education. This is not to claim that it is the province of teacher education exclusively. Rather, it is a project to be prized

and shared in all areas of the college or university. The point is that human relations education is not to be surrendered to any other university program; it is everyone's business, and it is integral to good teacher education.

The second assumption is that infusion is the most appropriate model for strengthening human relations education in programs for teacher education. Infusion means that the development of the concepts, skills, and attitudes necessary to good human relations permeates all dimensions of a teacher education program, so that students encounter them repeatedly.

What is being affirmed here is more than the simple pedagogy of repetition. This assumption proceeds from the recognition of the entitlement of every person, irrespective of gender, ethnicity, culture, or status, to be honored and promoted as a valuable human being. This entitlement is part of the foundational rationale out of which all egalitarian education arises, and is embodied in the goals toward which all egalitarian education points. Entitlement is an enduring principle. One finds statements affirming it in virtually every college statement of mission and purpose, going back much further in time than the recent attempts of professional accreditation and affirmative action agencies to address it, although such recent initiatives have provided a much-needed lever to pry principle into action. The chief virtue of infusion is that it keeps the principle of entitlement highly visible.

The third assumption is that even though there are considerable differences which distinguish the teacher education programs of one institution from those of another, all share two significant sets of commonalities, each of which serves to set parameters which shape programs into remarkably similar patterns.

The first commonality is program structure. It is typical to find a tripartate set of components: Foundations courses, Methods courses, and Practica. There may be variances among institutions in the internal composition

of each component, in the percentage of resources committed to each, or in the relative importance, perceived or real, of each component to the whole, but there appear to be no programs which have deleted any one of them, or add significantly to them. The point to be made here is that to assume human relations education as necessarily the business of teacher education, and to assume infusion as the best model, means that advancement in the concepts, skills, and attitudes pertinent to good human relations must occur in all three components.

An increasing congruence in criteria and structures for program accountability is the second commonality. The point has already been made that virtually every statement of mission and purpose of higher educational institutions includes statements affirming the entitlement of every human being to full and dignified recognition and advancement of his or her basic humanity. Were all institutions to work with equal intensity to implement this principle, all programs for teacher education would become more, and similarly, accountable for their activities in this area. In addition to such in-house accountability, teacher education programs are also subject to increasingly rigorous NCATE, state, and regional accreditation criteria which focus on human relations education. The criteria of these accrediting agencies are becoming more and more congruent with each other, and, in principle at least, more and more congruent with complementary statements of institutional mission and purpose. Increasingly, programs for teacher education, irrespective of location, are becoming subject to very similar criteria.

That teacher education programs share commonalities in structure and accountability which serve to shape them into similar patterns, leads to the fourth assumption, namely, that all persons engaged in teacher education can undertake a shared dialog for their mutual benefit. Given that not all teacher

educators, or teacher education programs, share equally in vision, circumstances, or resources, there remain important differences which may need to be recognized, and perhaps even promoted. As the discussion of these four assumptions delineates, however, the similarities among programs are also significant; each, therefore, can learn from the other.

It is the purpose of this panel to contribute to this common dialog. Each presentation is a "snapshot," either a case study in change efforts, or an illustration of human relations practices and content, or both. In each case, limited time prohibits the development of a full picture; in each case, however, enough detail is provided to enable one to compare and contrast what is presented with one's own situation and needs.

What holds each presentation together, in addition to its being grounded in the four assumptions just presented, is the agreement among panelists to work within the parameters of the same six questions, [illegible]h are:

1. How was the need to change assessed in my [illegible]ion? (Who assesses? How was assessment made? Incentives? Costs?)
2. Given the context of my institution's mission and purpose, and given the context of accreditation criteria, how did my department promote change?
3. How were our change efforts organized? (Who was involved? How were people put to use?)
4. What implementation activities were undertaken? (What needed to be done? Who had to do it? How did we secure and maintain the blessing and involvement of the administration?)
5. What is working? What is not working?
6. What do we see down the road?

What makes each presentation distinct is each panelist's selection of which questions to highlight, and the manner in which selected questions are addressed. What further distinguishes each presentation is the unique character of each institution represented here, and the role each presenter played in that institution. The first presentation is by Donna Cole, who reports from the perspective of an Education Department committee chairperson charged with the task of assessing present human relations education practices in Department programs, indentifying where and recommending how change could occur, and following through with supporting the implementation of approved changes. That this effort occurred within a university with strong commitments and programs in international/global education already in place, and was supported by a federal grant, is important contextual information. The second presentation, by Theresa McCormick, is a report from the perspective of a Multicultural Education Specialist, employed specifically to raise the level of human relations awareness across an institution, to show where and how specific improvements could be made in the human relations dimensions of programs for teacher education, and to assist in the direct implementation of those changes. The final presentation is by Donald Hayes, who reports from the perspective of a teacher educator who, since 1971, has been conducting a longitudinal study to determine the changes in value commitments experienced by college students from the time of their arrival on campus as freshmen to their graduation. Many of the values he has explored are directly and integrally related to human relations beliefs and actions.

Wittenberg University

Donna J. Cole

Wittenberg University is a liberal arts school in Ohio. The student population is approximately 2,400. Wittenberg is committed to a mission of educating liberally-minded graduates and "to develop the whole person - Intellectually, Spiritually, Socially, and Physically." (Wittenberg Registrar's Catalog, 1984-1986, p.1). Wittenberg supports the assumption that future citizens must possess human relations skills which will enable them to understand the "other." Whether "the other" is interpreted as meaning the diverse members of American society, or the multi-dimensional individuals in the world society, it is held that the complexity and connectedness of the human family must be understood. Following the university's lead, the Education department, believing that the nation's teachers must play a significant role in incorporating human relationship understanding in its gestalt, and diversity in the very fiber of learning content in schooling, made the decision to assess where, how, and if components were being addressed in its preservice programs.

This paper presents six steps in analyzing the incorporation of human relations within our education curriculum:

1. Exploring the need and present status of human relations in Education courses.
2. Assessing the position of the Education department within the larger university commitment for human relations understanding.
3. How the Education department organized its change efforts.
4. The actions taken to actualize the change.
5. Successes and failures of the process.
6. The perceived future.

In addition to our institutional and departmental commitments, we found three very pragmatic needs to implement our vision. One segment of this need was NCATE inclusion of the multicultural standard in its accreditation procedure. The department was scheduled for a team visit within two years. A second component of the need was that the state of Ohio had formulated guidelines for the incorporation of human relations topics within teacher education programs. The third component of our need was that major studies in education, as well as court decisions over the last twenty-five years, had mandated the promotion of human relations policies in teacher education. Together these factors clarified the vision of human relations needs, and prompted us to move quickly and effectively to meet them.

The first step of our activity was the presentation of a departmental questionnaire, through which it was found that human relations concepts were being addressed in the various courses, but not in an organized format, and not documented. Therefore, the department requested that human relations concepts be listed on syllabi and that units be developed to present human relations topics in a structured and complete manner within all courses.

The second step of this project evolved out of Wittenberg's publicly asserted commitment to the development of human relations. The university's mission statement declares "... for academic and social integrity, Wittenberg encourages an environment of respect for all people and diverse beliefs. The University community challenges its members to perceive themselves as servants in society through clarification, assessment, and development of their spiritual beliefs and ethical values as these are manifested in academic, personal, and social pursuits. Wittenberg teaches moral responsibility, social consciousness, vocational commitment, and constructive social change as the foundations of citizenship in the world's human community and in each person's particular

society." (Wittenberg Registrar's Catalog, p.1). Examples of the university affirmation of this mission are seen through the support of an International Office, staffed with an International Education Director, secretary, and student assistants; the establishment and support of an East Asian Department; the establishment of an International Education Committee; the development and support of a new Global Studies minor; and the institutional requirement that all students take both an "Other Culture" course as well as an "Interdisciplinary" course. These are a select few of many concrete examples of the university commitment to its mission statement goals. Since the university professes and values human relations understanding, the Education department obtained support throughout the project.

The third and fourth steps of analyzing our project are to look at our change effort design and action. The Education department charged a sub-committee to organize the direction and structure of human relations inclusion. The sub-committee provided a foundational scheme, and brought concrete proposals to the department. The dominant desire of the sub-committee was to have an infusion model. The sub-committee composed a rationale statement, suggested areas of permeation, endorsed two new elective courses, and outlined and recommended a student-teaching-abroad program. The rationale statement provided the justification for the time and monies being directed toward the project. The two courses developed were International and Comparative Issues in Education, and Multicultural Education: Toward a Culturally Pluralistic Society. These two courses were essential in our establishment of human relations, but were by no means the total curriculum package.

Since the sub-committee's goal was to establish an infusion model, these two courses were only a segment of the desired whole. The development of units

in existing courses emphasizing specific knowledge, skills, and attitudes in human relation understanding were the fundamental ingredients in the curriculum area of the project. These units are documented on all course syllabi. This is the core of our infusion model.

The final component dealing with curriculum and field experience was the student-teaching-abroad segment. The student-teaching-abroad recommendation presented by the sub-committee and eventually adopted by the department provided a teaching experience in one of four countries. The four field sites selected were Switzerland, England, Italy, and Mexico. Members of the sub-committee were chosen and funded to take information about Wittenberg to these sites, and, while there, to collect information about the school. This one-to-one discussion and negotiation enabled us to establish a strong cooperative program.

With curriculum and field experiences discussed, let's turn to professional participants. In our effort to carry out the project, faculty and participant personnel were identified. The sub-committee believed the total project should be accomplished in two phases. The first phases was to develop a total departmental awareness and knowledge; the second phase was to become actively involved in human relations teaching. To develop the first phase, consultants were recruited to give presentations and to lead round-table discussions. Also, specialists across Wittenberg's campus were employed to heighten our departmental understanding. Likewise, student teaching field site personnel were included in planning and communication. All members of the Education department participated in the first phase, so as to master the skills needed to successfully carry out the second phase of human relation teaching.

The fifth step that must be addressed is the project's successes and failures. The department underwent Ohio and NCATE accreditation visits and evaluations. Both agencies proclaimed that the department has established an

admirable human relations, multicultural component within the Wittenberg Education program. Thus it could be perceived that the project is successful. We have established new courses, infused human relations emphases across our curriculum, and have established an international student teaching program. However, problem areas do exist.

Two of the most pressing examples are legal and administrative problems involving two field sites, and the need for smoother correlation among units within existing courses. With respect to our field sites, we are having difficulty obtaining Visa permits for our student teachers in Italy, and recent administrative changes in England, recently settled, interfered with our placement of student teachers there. With respect to our need for greater correlation among human relations units in existing courses, we have become aware of the need for greater teamwork to insure the horizontal and vertical human relations development we seek in our students.

Looking into the future, the sixth step, yields a positive picture. It is the department's desire to establish more international field sites. Learning from some of the problems in the past, we hope to cultivate cooperation between our institution and International Schools with greater ease. The most useful lessons learned are that we must gain university support, and that we must assure that the goals of the project are <u>total</u> department goals, and continually strive for <u>teamwork</u>.

We are also optimistic that human relations pertinent to education can continue to be respectably infused into all courses. Part of our optimism proceeds from the desire of all Education faculty to accomplish the human relations goals. Part of our optimism is also due to our understanding of the relationship between global and multicultural education issues, and our proven ability to increase our students' awareness and acceptance in this area.

Underwriting both, however, is a sense that overall public awareness regarding the inter-relatedness of all the world's citizens is high, due in no small part to the efforts of educational associations. Our students and those who hire them are not only aware of the dimensions of human relations, but also more insistent that these issues be addressed in our schools now. Wittenberg's goals were established in an effort to fulfill the charge placed on preservice teacher training institutions to develop human relations understanding in future instructors. This paper has summarized our deliberate movement toward actualizing these goals.

Emporia State University

Theresa E. McCormick

I am going to describe the efforts to incorporate Multicultural Education into the teacher education programs at Emporia State University (ESU), Emporia, Kansas. It is a small university of about 6000 students, with a strong teacher education mission which dates back to its origins as a teacher education college. I worked at ESU as the Multicultural Education Specialist in the College of Education from 1981-1984, and was intensely involved in the planning and implementation of multicultural teacher education there.

Central to the basic teacher education programs at ESU is the assumption that the well-prepared teacher is able to work effectively with all children, including those from varied socioeconomic, religious, and racial backgrounds, and those with exceptionalities. Prior to my coming to ESU, the College of Education had engaged in a variety of activities for over a decade which were designed to provide education equity for all individuals and to deal with multicultural issues such as racism and sexism.

For now, I will begin with question number one, "How was the need to change assessed in my institution?" By creation of the Multicultural Education Specialist position in 1981, the Dean of the College of Education, and other administrators, were making an important move indicating their understanding of the need for change in the area of multicultural teacher education at ESU.

In an effort to obtain a broad base of support and understanding of multicultural teacher education, one of my first efforts was to organize a Multicultural Advisory Committee. It was made up of cross-campus representatives (who served as links between the College of Education and their department), administrators, university students, and public school teachers.

This group, with my leadership, carried out the needs assessment at ESU. During February 1983, we conducted a survey to determine the extent of inclusion and the nature of multicultural education in courses and programs throughout the university. All faculty members received the survey via department chairpersons, who provided a modicum of incentive to respond. Approximately 70% of the faculty did return the survey. It addressed three major areas: (1) activities related to multicultural education which were carried out in courses taught, (2) a self-inventory for faculty members, and (3) "products" related to multicultural education, such as research, publications, media, or presentations.

While a detailed description of the results of the survey is not needed here, a few findings are important to highlight. The institution-wide data indicated several areas of strength--one being that 90% of the respondents indicated a high level of awareness of the changing roles, perspectives and contributions of females as related to their disciplines. Also, there was a high level of awareness concerning textbooks, curriculum materials, and teacher-made tests in relation to multicultural issues. However, only 29% of the respondents indicated that they make suggestions to the university library for acquisitions which reflect a multicultural/nonsexist perspective, and very few, under 8% of the faculty, were involved in writing, research, or other "products" related to multicultural education. Another finding concerning the inclusion of multicultural activities in courses gave us an indication of needed changes in the curricula. That data indicated that only 34% of the faculty were implementing the listed activities in their courses.

The next question to be addressed at ESU was "How to organize our change efforts?" With my leadership and the support of the advisory committee, the College of Education identified an infusion model as the means of providing for

multicultural education. Multicultural education at ESU is viewed as an ongoing process, with concepts and activities being integrated into existing programs and not added on as separate elements. In the Elementary Teacher Education Program, for example, the Introduction to Teaching course was ammended to include guest speakers, class discussions, and observations in local public schools, all of which featured multicultural concepts. In the Introduction to the Exceptional Child course, objectives were adjusted, and reading were added. Additional objectives were written for all courses in the pre-student teaching semester, with new activites, readings, and guest speakers appropriate for the new objectives being developed. For the student teaching semester, new competencies, activities, readings, seminars, and action labs were developed, and students were offered the option of a student teaching placement in a multicultural setting.

In the Secondary Teacher Education Program, guest speakers, class discussions, and observations in public schools were added to the Introduction to Teaching course. In the pre-student teaching semester, course objectives were modified, new activities and readings (some required) were added, and observations in public schools were made more focused through the provision of specific observational guidelines and a required teacher interview. As in the case of the Elementary program, the student teaching semester was ammended to include new competencies, activities, readings, seminars, and action labs, and students were also offered the option of student teaching in a multicultural setting.

While infusion is the basic approach for the development of multicultural education in teacher education programs, elective courses are also offered which provide a more in-depth examination of concepts, issues, and trends in the field.

It was decided that the basic core of teacher education courses would be reviewed for inclusion of multicultural education. Thus, I, as the specialist, reviewed each course syllabus, and set-up conferences to discuss areas for possible changes or additions; later, the professors submitted revised syllabi and reading lists.

Efforts to make changes throughout the other colleges in the university were carried out by their respective representatives on the Multicultural Advisory Committe, as well as by the department chairpersons and myself.

Next, I will discuss what implementation activities were undertaken. First, I will give a few examples related to the review and revision of teacher education courses mentioned earlier. For example, the following abbreviated syllabus for the course, Teaching Language Arts in the Elementary School, indicates how we went about critiquing and changing courses. The underlined areas show my suggestions to the professor for changes or additions in the course:

CI 315: Teaching Language Arts in the Elementary School

COURSE DESCRIPTION - The course ...(1) ..., (2) the importance of spoken and written language and its imporance in relation to <u>both verbal and nonverbal</u> communication skills (3) ... (4) ... (5) ... (6) ... (7) ...<u>the understanding of diversity in language use</u>.

OBJECTIVES - 1. <u>Students will become aware of the essential knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary for understanding and respecting the language and dialects of children from diverse backgrounds</u>.

2. <u>Students will understand that a first language or dialect other than standard English interferes seriously with performance in applications of such language skills as reading and writing - and with ultimate performance in subject matter areas</u>.

COURSE OUTLINE

II. Written Composition
A. Methods of promoting creative writing, including <u>language experience</u>.

IV. Speaking and Listening
C. <u>The importance of nonverbal communication for the culturally different child</u>.

V. Story Telling
   E. Value of folk-stories from different cultures.

VI. Suggested Activities
   B. Poetry File, including poetry by minorites and women
   E. Bulletin Board Ideas, including multiethnic pictures
   H. Puppet, including multiethnic characters
   I. Flannel Board Set, including multicultural characters, stories, etc.
   L. Teaching games for language arts, including games from various cultures.

Other Suggested Activities or Assignments

1. Describe in a brief paper how language use perpetuates racism, sexism, classism, agism, and handicapism.
2. Describe an alternative (to the traditional approach) method for language arts instruction which would be compatible with a pluralistic population.
3. Study and then report to class on dialect variations as reflections of different human speech communities.
4. Design five language arts activities consistent with the abilities and needs of linguistically diverse students (specify a language or dialect).

Secondary courses were similarly revised. Competencies, activities and references were added to the three courses taken during the student teaching semester (Foundations of Curriculum Development; Guidance in the Classroom; Professional Relations of Teachers). Of particular interest might be the multicultural "Points for Observation" and "Questions for Interview" which became a required part of public school field observations in the course CI 333: Principles of Secondary Education:

POINTS FOR OBSERVATION: MULTICULTURAL

1. Are there materials (books, pictures, displays, artifacts, films, records, etc.) which reflect the diversity within the classroom?

2. Are the identified "different" students included in peer social groups?

3. Are the identified "different" students self-segregating themselves?

4. Can you determine if these students have been academically grouped, tracked, or labeled in ways which appear to be unfair?

5. Are these students receiving help as far as you can observe in areas of special learning or language difficulty?

6. Describe the observable behavior of the identified students (e.g., passive, active, timid, withdrawn, boisterous, rude, cooperative, loud, well-mannered, etc.).

QUESTIONS FOR INTERVIEW: MULTICULTURAL

1. How many students do you have in class who are culturally, ethnically, or racially "different" from the majority?

2. What sort of difference do these students have? (e.g. difference based on race, language, home environment, religion, nationality)

3. Do these students interact freely and cooperate with you and their peers?

4. To what degree do you take advantage of the varied cultural heritage present in the classroom? Are the differences viewed as an asset or as problems or deficits?

5. Do any of the students identified above have culture-related learning or reading difficulties? If so, what is being done to help them overcome the difficulties?

In addition to the components in required courses, multicultural exposure was offered to students via guest lecturers, siminars, action, labs, films, field trips, theatrical productions, and student teaching experiences in multicultural settings.

Another aspect of implementation activity related to faculty development that I initiated. Consultants, speakers, films and seminars were provided to help raise the awareness, sensitivity, understanding and commitment of faculty to multicultural education. Also, I edited a newletter, "The Multicultural Monitor," which was disseminated to all faculty and staff, and I felt that it helped build awareness and "visibility" for multicultural issues and concerns on campus. I also served as a consultant and resource speaker for other professor's classes in our college as well as those in other colleges.

These implementation activities were supported by the Dean, who would write letters of support for programs, encouraging faculty participation. He and most department chairpersons and other administrators set a good example by attending the multicultural programs and functions which I arranged. The involvement of

one department chairperson, for example, was maintained by the fact that he was the co-chair of the Multicultural Advisory Committee.

These beginning indication of change were consistent with one of the key purposes of teacher edcuation at ESU. That is, to prepare teachers to facilitate the development of all students and to help them become contributing members of our changing, pluralistic, society. ESU historically was a teacher education institution, and that aspect remained one of its main strengths in the 1980s. Since all the colleges involved with teacher training were closely intertwined with the College of Education because of methods courses, advising students, and supervision of student teachers, our concerns with multicultural education became known to them also. Through the Council on Teacher Education, which was composed of representatives from all units of the university involved in teacher education, as well as the Multicultural Advisory Committee, the proposed changes were beginning to be filtered throughout the campus. The proposed changes, as well as those already implemented when I left, were definitely within the context of the NCATE multicultural education standard.

Since Leaving ESU, I have received a copy of the Multicultural Newsletter, and know that the Advisory Committee is still functioning. I was assured that a search for a new Multicultural Specialist would begin during the Spring semester. The NCATE visit was scheduled to be this Spring, so that provides incentive to maintain the specialist position and activity in the multicultural teacher education area.

Lenoir-Rhyne College

Donald G. Hayes

All teacher education instituions are concerned, in some ways, with Human Relations. In some programs, "Human Relations" means providing students with information about different cultures--and the implications of this information for today's classroom teacher. In other teacher education programs, the "human relations" component of the program means clarifying to prospective teachers the teaching implications resulting from the social and interdependent naure of persons. Human relations in some teacher education programs is characterized by efforts to develop the interpersonal skills of the aspiring teacher. Whatever the specifics, the goal is to prepare persons who can sensitively teach students from diverse backgrounds and, at the same time, transmit to their students important knowledge about the human family. Generally, underlying all these efforts is a concern that such values as openness, tolerance, and respect for others will be strengthened within the prospective teacher (and his/her students) since a commitment to such values is so important in living in a world community--and, of course, is of critical importance for persons living in a democratic society committed to equality.

While values development is likely cited by most directors of teacher education programs as being of central importance in their programs, it is likely that little--if anything--is done by those persons to determine their success in the achievement of these important goals. In almost all programs there is evidence of the testing of students regarding their knowledge of different cultures but not about how these students feel about such differences or, as an example, how much "respect" or "tolerance" they have for other persons.

Because the testing of values (affective) is more difficult than the testing of knowledge (cognitive), most of us in education--and certainly teacher education--don't bother to find out if values shifts among students are occurring. This creates an unfortunate inconsistency. What we test for is supposedly a reflection of what we think is important--and by making relatively little effort to test in this area, we, in effect, are making a public statement that we don't think values development is very important--aside from the pedagogical problem of our continuing with teaching practices not knowing the validity of such efforts in the achievement of expressed and desired objectives.

How does this relate to our assigned topic of change and Human Relations? Human Relations programs in teacher education would likely be significantly improved if persons responsible for such programs would make a more concerted effort to measure value shifts that their students experience that might have resulted from participation in the human relations program. Teacher educators have a responsibility to make a reasonable attempt to determine how well they are achieving their program objectives. (We certainly expect our students to do this in their student teaching!) Unfortunately, in almost all institutions of higher learning--supposedly committed to scholarly inquiry--very little evaluation data regarding programs is acquired. What an irony! This is morally and pedagogically wrong!

At Lenoir-Rhyne College, a small Lutheran school in North Carolina (1300 students), I have been directing since 1971 a longitudinal study to determine the changes in value commitments experienced by our students from their entrance until their graduation. Like most church-related colleges, we make claims in our catalog about our special mission and the distinctiveness of our program. We claim--implicitly or explicitly--that our students acquire certain values or religious commitments which our sponsoring body deems important. Typically,

most private church-related colleges are more expensive to attend. Those of us who work in such institutions frequently claim that because students do acquire important values (that they would not acquire elsewhere), the additional costs are justified.

The initial results which were obtained at Lenoir-Rhyne were discouraging. We learned from pre-post testing involving our students and several control groups that our students were not acquiring the values we were claiming in our catalog that they were acquiring. Our institution (including the Faculty and Board of Trustees) decided that if we were going to continue advertising that students attending our school acquire important values, we needed to significantly improve our efforts to put systematically more emphasis on values development in the classroom--aside from the general concern to provide a "caring community" in which positive values are modeled. While much remains to be done, we have made much progress at Lenoir-Rhyne in the implementation of a values-based curriculum. It started with the acquisition of some data which suggested that we were not doing what we wanted to do--or claimed to be doing. Similarly, persons responsible for teacher education programs who desire to change and improve the human relations component of their programs need good hard data. Assuming the formation of important related values, e.g., tolerance, openness, respect for other, is an important program goal, an evaluation program that attempts to assess student commitments to such values should be implemented.

Although our experience at Lenoir-Rhyne is limited and perhaps should not be generalized, I believe we have acquired some insights about the change process that might be useful to other teacher educators concerned with the improvement of human relations programs. I will share four observations:

1. Appeals to logic are not very effective in promoting change. Example: "Colleagues, our student teachers will be preparing persons to live in a 'world' community. Therefore, our programs should reflect this reality." The "appeals to logic" approach is the approach most often used on college campuses even though there is good documentation that this approach is not very effective in producing results. (An AACTE Eric Clearinghouse Fact Sheet published in February 1981, titled "The Institutionalization of Planned Change in Schools," by Pankratz and Martray, documented this point.)

2. Change cannot be imposed. We see constantly evidence of this point when persons attempt to force others to do something they don't want to do. In almost all cases, coersion does not work. As this point relates to teacher education, I suspect that many "Multi-Cultural Education Specialists" have been hired in teacher education programs to develop and implement new programs. Unless efforts were made by these persons to work with the remaining staff to get them to the point of desiring the proposed changes, it is likely that when the multi-cultural specialist left (after the Federal grant terminated), little substantive program changes occurred.

3. It is easier to change things than it is to change people. We have witnessed in recent years many attempts to effect change in education. Most of these attempts have focused on things, e.g., redesigning books, knocking out walls of classrooms. Relatively little effort has been made to change the persons (teachers) who were expected to perform in the new setting. And what did the unchanged teacher do? Not surprisingly, she figuratively "put the walls back" with make-shift coat racks, etc. Persons responsible for improving human relations programs in teacher education should spend less time, as an example, developing multi-cultural modules (things), and more time working directly with his/her teacher educator colleagues in involving them in struggling with an

analysis of their related values, on the assumption that such struggle will result in growth and change and, in turn, programmatic changes will result.

4. Behaviors which are rewarded are most likely to recur. Although this is a very important principle of learning, it is one that we fail to utilize in our behavior. As this principle relates to our topic, directors of teacher education programs desiring change in their programs must reward the teacher educator for desired behavior, e.g., recognition and public affirmation. If self-esteem is enhanced, related behaviors will follow! Praise! That's the answer to the question of how to create change in teacher education programs.

Conclusion

We who work directly in the provision of teacher education understand the limitations of these reports. We know that the manner in which different institutions approach and implement an infusion of human relations emphases into their curricula will vary according to the way they experience their needs, and the resources they have available. These presentations have illustrated this point. We further understand the limitations of synopses, such as these reports have been, to present all the subtle yet relevant dynamics at work in the process of change in each of these institutions. Finally, we know that we cannot assume that a procedure which worked in one setting to effect change is automatically transferable to any other particular setting.

Nevertheless, given our common needs, and given the commonalities in our programs, it is likely that there are elements in each report which, singly or in some adaptive combination, can serve to promote the infusion of human relations emphases into any program for teacher education.